DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 264 SP 002 248

A Report of the Nineteenth Annual Kansas College Conference and Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference on Teacher Education; An Examination of Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

Kansas Advisory Council on Education.; Kansas State Dept. of Public Instruction, Topeka.; Kansas State Teachers Association.

Pub Date 68

Note-43p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.20

Descriptors-Academic Standards, *Accreditation (Institutions), *Conference Reports, *Evaluation Criteria, Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, *Standards, *Teacher Education Curriculum

Identifiers-AACTE, American Association of Colleges for Tea, *Kansas, National Commission on Teacher Education, National Council for Accreditation of Te, NCATE, NCTEPS

The major portion of this report consists of speeches examining the work of a committee appointed by The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in 1966 to propose standards and evaluative criteria for the accreditation of teacher education. Speeches presented include: "NCATE Faces the 1970's" by Rolf W. Larson, director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education; "Professional Accreditation of Programs in Teacher Education" by Edwin P. Adkins, associate vice president for research and program development, Temple University; "A Reaction for the Kansas Teacher Education and Professional Standards Commission" by Daryl E. Berry, state consultant, National Commission on Teacher Education Professional Standards; "A Reaction for the State Colleges and Universities" by J.D. McComas, dean, College of Education, Kansas State University; "A Reaction for the Council of Church-Related Colleges" by B.A. Gessner, dean of the college, Baker University; "A Reaction for Kansas School Administrators" by Alvin E. Morris, superintendent of schools, Wichita, Kansas; "A Reaction for Kansas Teachers" by Jessie Nichol, president, Kansas State Teachers Association; and "Summary Statement of Kansas College Conference and Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference on Teacher Education" by Edward C. Pomeroy, executive secretary, AACTE. Also included are the ideas and reactions to the proceedings of 14 discussion groups composed of teachers, administrators, and professors. (SM)

ED027264

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A REPORT ON THE

Nineteenth Annual

KANSAS COLLEGE CONFERENCE AND TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS CONFERENCE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

AN EXAMINATION OF:
STANDARDS AND EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR THE ACCREDITATION OF TEACHER EDUCATION

Held At
THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
LAWRENCE, KANSAS
on
October 11, 1968

SP002748

CONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Kenneth E. Anderson, University of Kansas, Chairman and Editor
Aldan M. Bebb, Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Daryl E. Berry, Kansas State Teachers Association
Sister Magdalita Bruns, Marymount College
Leonard M. Chaffee, Wichita State University
Roger Daeschner, Goodland High School
Alex A. Daughtry, Kansas State Teachers College
Benjamin A. Gessner, Baker University
Aaron W. Harper, Kansas State College of Pittsburg
F. Floyd Herr, State Department of Public Instruction
Charles Kerr, Southwestern College
Rev. Cletus Kohake, St. Benedict's College
James McComas, Kansas State University
Albert Nelson, Kansas Wesleyan University
W. R. Oldham, Washburn University
Richard Shepherd, Kansas State Teachers Association
Beth Warren, Student, Kansas State University
Mary Margaret Williams, Cowley County Community Junior College
W. Clement Wood, Fort Hays Kansas State College
August Zemke, Salina Public Schools

The Kansas College Conference and Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference on Teacher Education is sponsored by the Kansas Advisory Council on Education in cooperation with the institutions of higher learning in Kansas, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the Kansas State Teachers Association.

It is the purpose of the conference to improve teacher education in Kansas through cooperative effort. Continuous improvement in programs of preparation for teachers is evidence that achievement can be accomplished through attacking problems cooperatively.

FOREWORD

The nineteenth annual College Kansas Conference and Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference on Teacher Education was held on October 11, 1968, at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. Over 400 educators from every part of Kansas gathered for the occasion. The general opinion of these educators was that this college conference of 1968 was outstanding in many respects and richly rewarding to all who wish to improve the education of teachers.

The general topic of the conference was "an examination of: Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education." These proposed standards are the work of a committee appointed two years ago (and at work during the past two years) by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The assignment on which the committee worked was the writing of a new set of standards against which the quality of programs in teacher preparation may be measured. This project including the writing, trial application and final approval will extend over three years. The discussion of the proposed standards at this time and before final approval was certainly most timely. Since standards represent goals and goals are essential in any self-examination, these new standards for teacher education should motivate all parties involved in teacher education to a critical review of their programs looking toward the development of better programs together with exploration and experimentation in the field of teacher education.

The special speakers and resource leaders for the conference were all national figures in the area of teacher education: Rolf W. Larson, Director, NCATE; Edwin P. Adkins, Associate Vice-President for Research and Program Development at Temple University and Chairman of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee; and Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Secretary, AACTE.

This Nineteenth College Conference was of significance not only because of the vital importance of the general theme and the national standing of the special speakers, but also because the conference is another landmark in cooperative effort. In this respect the following two paragraphs printed on the program are indicative of this point:

> "The Kansas College Conference and Teacher Education and Professional Standards Conference on Teacher Education is sponsored by the Kansas Advisory Council on Education in cooperation with the institutions of higher learning in Kansas, the State Department of Public Instruction, and the Kansas State Teacher Association.
>
> "It is the purpose of the conference to improve teacher education in Kansas through cooperative effort. Continuous improvement in programs of preparation for teachers is evidence that achievement can be accomplished through attacking problems cooperatively."

Finally, it should be pointed out that the people involved in planning the conference worked well in every respect. Special mention should be made of F. Floyd Herr, Eileen Heinen, Melvin Neely, and Daryl E. Berry. Dean Kenneth E. Anderson, Chairman of the Conference Planning Committee, should receive special commendation for the part he played in regard to the conference. The general theme was suggested by him. He invited and secured the special speakers for the conference. He arranged for the excellent hospitality extended to the conference by the University of Kansas. In a very real sense the conference concretely illustrates the excellent leadership he has exercised in teacher education in Kansas during the past seventeen years.

B.A. GESSNER
President, Kansas Advisory
Council on Education.

NCATE FACES THE 1970's

ROLF W. LARSON
Director, National Council For Accreditation of Teacher Education

Although NCATE was created in 1954, it is rooted in accreditation ideas as they developed after the Second World War, especially within the AACTE of the late 1940's and early '50's. Even though NCATE will next have only its 15th birthday, its philosophical birthday may be considered to be 20 or more.

At the present we stand on the eve of completely new Standards, looking ahead to a new decade—the 1970's. This is a time for reassessing many things, for asking some difficult questions, for looking at the future to try to see what new Standards should be. Although in this short talk I cannot search out all the issues of all of the problems and questions, I do want to talk to you about one of the big questions. Before I do so, let me outline for you, as I see them, some of the questions which might be asked, some of the issues which might be explored in relationship to Standards. Then I shall discuss in more detail one of the more knotty issues which is facing those who must consider new Standards, the issue of accrediting specific programs rather than institutions or general categories of program.

Here are some questions as I see them, which should be asked as we near 1970:

a. After 15 years of accrediting activity, are there some areas for which NCATE has served its most useful purpose? Could efforts in those areas now be lessened? Stopped? Has the law of diminishing returns reached us yet in some areas of activity?

b. In an opposite vein, are these some areas of activity (as, for example, the accreditation of programs to prepare professors of Education, as has been suggested by some) in which accredita-

tion activities might be begun? Are there some trades that should be made?

c. What are the most valuable, the most needed, of our accreditation activities insofar as the public is concerned? What does the teaching profession need from us most at this point? Is a a general rating for a college enough? A rating for a general area of study? A rating of a specific program? Do they need most to know: (1) that Ivy is good, (2) that the School of Education is good, (3) or that the program to prepare guidance counselors is good?

d. Is the nature of the total accrediting package changing? Are the regional associations doing a different job or is their job the same? How does their job relate to ours? Is there some overlap of consequence? If there is, what adjustments need to to be made? If their job hasn't changed, should it?

e. Continuing the previous item, what do the growing interests of the professional groups mean to us? Should NCATE recognize in some way the intensive desire of these groups for a more detailed evaluation of a specific program? What will be the direction of the activities of these organizations if we do not recognize their interests? Is a move toward their interest likely to be in the best interest of accreditation? Of institutions? Should such accreditation become an integral part of the package?

f. Continuing the factor further (the accreditation package), what relationships for NCATE are inherent in the accrediting activities of related organizations? There is accreditation in Art and Music and in Art and Music Education, but no organic tie between them. There is accrediting activity in Speech and Hearing and for Speech Teaching, but no organic tie between them, for Counseling Psychology and Clinical Psychology and for School Counselor and School Psychologist, but no organic ties. Should such ties be established? Is the present dichotomy wasteful? Does it make sense? Is it likely that the National Commission on Accrediting will establish more accrediting agencies which will relate in the same way? Should NCATE move to give up the specialities for which there are accrediting agencies? Would such a splintering off of programs now accredited by NCATE in a general way lower the Council's effectiveness on a long-range basis? Would it encourage other organizations to seek to become accrediting agencies? Would NCATE be effective if a number of special programs (e.g., School Psychology) were put in the hands of others?

g. From the standpoint of the technical problem of evaluation, has the state of the craft advanced so that significant steps can be taken to measure more of the "substantive" and less of the "form" of an institution in the accreditation act? Is the "form vs. substance" problem in accreditation closer to solution than it was? What are the elements of research which should be put to use in the accreditation act?

h. How relevant and important and how necessary is the concept of "reciprocity" to accreditation? Several reciprocity systems are developing. Do these have a bearing on what we do in accreditation? Could the development of such systems outside of accreditation tend to decrease the effectiveness of accreditation? If so, should accreditation people assume any leadership in the related field of reciprocity?

As one can see, the problems and issues are many. The answers are difficult to find. From the foregoing, let me now address to you some remarks relating to the issue of "program accreditation."

One of the more pressing problems now facing the Council is that of deciding its position relative to the issue of "general vs. program" accreditation. The issue relates to whether an institution should receive a rather general accreditation evaluation and rating as opposed to an evaluation and rating for specific programs. There seem to be many advantages and disadvantages to either position—the issue is a knotty one. There is the additional difficulty even if there were 100% agreement that a change to "program evaluation" was desirable, that it would be most difficult to accomplish. Let us examine together some of the factors which relate to this issue:

1. A first factor is the regional accrediting association, of which there are six. While they perform essentially the same general function, they are different, one from another, and do not have exactly the same policies and procedures. NCATE, as a professional accrediting association, cannot assume exactly the same base from each. The Association which you in Kansas know, the NCA, visits or inspects every new graduate program. We know this has been done. With the others, this isn't true. It is likely that if the graduate program in general is accredited, a new MA program for school counselors will simply share that accreditation without benefit of an additional visit. This attention to program in the NCA area, incidentally, is not completely without argument. Some associations responsible for programs, of which NCATE could be one, argue that the accreditation of specific professional programs (such as school superintendent or speech therapists) is not a legitimate function of a regional association.

I hope this makes clear that one of the factors relating to the regional base we assume is the different coverage or examination given by the different associations. Another is the degree of rigor applied. Among the most rigorous seems to be the North Central. Some others, on occasion, seem to be almost perfunctory.

One characteristic which relates to the accreditation of all professional accrediting groups is the fact that while general strength is indicated by the regional stamp of approval, specific subject strength is not indicated. Therefore, nursing cannot assume strong biology or chemistry departments, NCATE cannot assume strong teaching majors, and so on. Referring momentarily to the MAYOR STUDY of accreditation and his criticism that accreditation in teacher education did not encompass real knowledge of subject matter strength, you will understand the NCATE problem when NCATE assumes that regional accreditation assures subject matter competence.

FRACHE is working on the problem of coordinating the activities and policies of the six regional associations.

The regional philosophy of accepting almost every institution into the fold and then helping them to grow is in contradistinction to the philosophy of most professional agencies. The professional agencies are seeking to select the better institutions at some definable and acceptable level of goodness.

2. State Departments of Education comprise a second factor relating to Standards. They have legal responsibility which some can delegate to others (NCATE in Oregon), while others cannot. Some are very powerful and use their power. Others are not so developed and do not exhibit much power.

In spite of the power and activity differences, most in the end accept and approve all institutions seeking to prepare teachers. We have said the regional association accredits almost everyone as a part of its philosophy to stimulate growth. Examining recent statistics of which the following are just typical, one sees that the regionals are often exceeded by the approval given within individual states.

	Number of Institutions Approved by State Authorities to Prepare Teachers	Number Accredited by Regional Associations	Number Accredited by NCATE
Illinois	57	46	21
Kansas	24	23	13
Oklahoma	17	17	14
Nebraska	20	16	13
Colorado	12	12	7
Missouri	34	33	13

A third characteristic of the State operation is that the States do not apply a national standard. Fifty State standards are applied, with more or less rigor.

Fourthly, it can be noted that in spite of an *almost* universal acceptance or approval of college programs by State agencies, many States visit with rigor—with strong teams and strong standards. Some exceed the rigor of an NCATE visit. The weak point is that for some reason, probably political, they do not disapprove anyone in spite of rigorous examinations.

Relating back to the idea of new Standards for a moment, it should be noted that what States *need* from NCATE, if they need anything, is *program information*. Twenty-eight States now issue licenses on the basis of NCATE accreditation (the phenomenon of reciprocity). More States would do so if they could get selective program information.

A final observation about the State operation is that national efforts are underway to strengthen State Departments of Education. How this relates to the problem of new Standards at this time seems minimal, but it could be a factor in the future.

To summarize, State Departments vary in strength and rigor of approval techniques. They seem to approve all colleges in spite of

the rigor of the visit. They do not apply national standards. They need program information from NCATE for reciprocity purposes.

3. Professional organizations (ASCD, APGA, AASA) in Education are expanding and growing stronger. They have longer membership rolls, play an increasingly strong role in the specialty they represent. They are striving to promote professional characteristics with respect to: (1) training, (2) standards, (3) policing, and (4) protecting the public. Most are upgrading the qualifications of their memberships. They are stimulating improved collegiate programs. They seek to get rid of, or upgrade, the poorly prepared in their midst. They seek to find ways to *reserve practice* for the qualified.

Naturally this relates strongely to accreditation. They want accreditation to be a tool for improving training programs. AASA uses accreditation as a membership yardstick. These organizations constitute a powerful and growing pressure for the inspection of specific programs rather than some kind of blanket approval. AAHPER, for example, is dismayed when NCATE gives blanket approval (accreditation) for all secondary programs when this means accrediting a physical education program they know to be below standard. The same is true in Industrial Arts Education and others.

What can one expect of professional organizations of this type in the years ahead? If I read the signs correctly, we can expect: (1) increasing solidarity, (2)continued growth and financial power, (3) setting of higher standards, and (4) a drive for more professional attributes. They will be an increasing force to reckon with. They are not going to just go away.

4. Professional accrediting associations are growing in number and skill and power. They are consolidating, learning, improving. NCATE is a more solid agent today than ten years ago. It represents more experience. It has better tested practices. This is true of all of the agencies.

The Commission faces today requests from other agencies to become accrediting bodies. You may expect such requests to come from several groups. Professional groups are finding out how accreditation can help further their ends. How much of an expansion there will be is hard to determine but one could predict a slow, steady expansion. This being the case, one must ask what this means for NCATE and for Standards. We now have, for example, a professional agency to accredit in Music—NASM. Music education belongs to NCATE, music to NASM. But the dividing line is arbitrary. NASM is vitally interested in music education and wants to cooperate. They are willing to help assess music competency for those who will *teach* music. How can this potential be utilized? Should it be utilized? But to be utilized, NCATE accreditation needs to be focused on programs.

What does the future hold for this area of endeavor? One might cautiously predict the slow establishment of more accrediting agencies in fields related to teaching. Home Economics? Perhaps. Guidance? Possibly. We now have several, as for example, NASM in Music, NASA, in Art, ASHA in Speech, and others. This family should grow, and how NCATE could or should relate to it is a big question as one considers Standards.

5. The National Commission on Accrediting has been mentioned. We might point out that quite legitimately an organization of 1300 presidents is going to look at accreditation as administrators will do—from a standpoint relating to the administration of their institutions and our disruption of it. They are bound to relate to accreditation in terms of cost, local autonomy, interruption of campus routine.

But presidents are also specialists (engineers, doctors, political scientists) and they know how accreditation affects these fields. And they are not unintelligent. They share with us a professional point of view. I think we can expect their actions, their approval of new accrediting agencies, to reflect a compromise between their professional connections and their administrative problems. Therefore, expect, I think, slow but steady growth of accreditation agencies.

6. Collegiate institutions, individually or as represented through collegiate organizations such as AACTE, AAC, and AASCU, constitute another force related to accrediting. Agencies like NCATE cost them money, upset their routine with our evaluation activities, upset or tamper with their autonomy and priorities. We can expect reactions logical to such incursions; it would be strange if we didn't get them. We might anticipate a particular point of view based on these phenomena from institutions and collegiate organizations where administrators are the primary participants.

Coupled with this, however, is a growing pattern of decentralization which is probably a phenomenon associated with growth. As institutions get big, they find it increasingly difficult to be monolithic. Powerful sub-groups (schools, colleges, departments) develop. The loyalties of sub-groups differ from that of the administration. (School of Education are much closer and more loyal to NCATE than the college administration.) But even in Schools of Education, a department of educational administration may be closer to AASA than to NCATE, guidance to APGA than to NCATE.

We see in college such phenomena as the growth of faculty power. We see student revolt, state coordination, state systems, consortiums. Strangely enough, campuses are too big and not big enough. In this pattern of change, the president seems not to be in the the driver's seat as he once was. He is not so often the policy setter. As the power shifts from administrative hands to faculty groups, one might anticipate less of an administrative relationship with institutions and more of a professional one. What I'm saying is that if a campus gets so big that separate schools become more authoritative, we may see a different kind of relationship between institution and professional accrediting agencies. And if groups develop within Schools of Education, we may expect more pressure toward specific programs.

7. Still another factor to note is that comprised by the Council's five CONSTITUENT ORGANIZATIONS. They have proven to be remarkably good bedfellows, but they have differences of view, too. AACTE, for example, is more representative of an institutional or administrative point of view than is TEPS, quite naturally, although AACTE is very professionally oriented, too. Presidents are still powerful in AACTE and they bring their administrative problems as well as their

professional views with them. TEPS has represented a strongly professional view through the years. I remember a prominent TEPS representative once saying (on speaking about TEPS participation with NCATE) that TEPS would want "out" if NCATE didn't mean something, if NCATE didn't truly evaluate and eliminate some institutions. TEPS will never stand still for senatorial courtesy, for mutual scratching of backs. NASDTEC, as we saw earlier, is concerned with certification. Naturally we could expect them to have a different focus. The same is true for CCSSO and NSBA. The point I make is that our five parents, agreeable as they are, represent different focuses of action, and probably somewhat different views about what the future of NCATE should be.

8. I could talk hours about NCATE as a factor to consider. I could reveal its dreams and aspirations, its struggle to improve its image, and its work to improve its processes. Let me cite just a few of its characteristics that relate to standards and to the issue of program accreditation I am discussing:

a. First, there is workload. Our association has the greatest load of all professional organizations. We have 450-plus accredited institutions. To get around to them, we must do 50 general visits a year. Picture the increase in work if we did 20 programs at each institution. While the pool of experienced team members has grown through the years, the machinery is not ready for this.

   The logistics of program accreditation are frightening. The coordination of activities with many professional groups, some already involved with accreditation in their own right and some not, is a large order.

b. NCATE still has organizational problems in the sense that it seeks an improved evaluative machinery.

c. Financial support is not in sight at the moment for widespread expansion of activity which program accrediting would certainly bring. It supports at a reasonable but not a very affluent level, a program of generalized accreditation but not program accreditation.

d. There is still much conflict about a definition of teacher education, about appropriate professional preparation, about appropriate subject matter preparation. The Council has reached no definitive special program to require.

For 30 minutes, more or less, I have been sharing with you some of the factors which relate to just one of the issues which have to be faced with respect to new Standards. We haven't discussed many others—as for example, whether standards ought to focus on performance rather than on resources, whether they are best couched in general rather than specific terms, at what level they should be pegged, and so on. Let me try to summarize just a bit and move toward the end of this talk.

I think we have seen much progress in the past ten years to bridge the traditional gap between the professional and academic camps in

teacher education. We see mathematicians and English professors sincerely interested in discussing accreditation problems. We see organizations in the disciplines willing to cooperate and participate. One of them has said to me that he sees a growing readiness to move toward greater cooperation in assessing individual programs. But he cautioned me that program accreditation can never work unless the organizations go with us. I think this is true. If program accreditation materializes, it won't go unless NCATE can find mutually acceptable ways of working with such groups as mathematics, English, and guidance. Fortunately for us all the signs seem increasingly good for such cooperation.

Let me summarize by creating a mental picture where NCATE stands and relates to a host of other groups:

a. There are 1100 institutions as a base. All have teacher-education programs.
b. There are six regional associations embracing the 1100 institutions.
c. NCATE has five constituent organizations: AACTE, TEPS, CCSSO, NASDTEC, and NASB.
d. There are 50 state departments of educations relating in various ways to NCATE.
e. There are several professional accrediting agencies such as NASM, NASA, and APA ready to participate with NCATE in varying degrees of readiness.
f. In addition to the above there are some ten to twenty non-accrediting organizations which exert pressure on NCATE.

Make a note again of 1100 institutions. Some want more specific accreditation, more specific pointing out of what needs improving. Some want to be accredited but want to hide their faults. Some want no relationship to accreditation. Note the regionals. Not all are alike.. One at least shows some tendency to be moving from general to specific visits, in part at least. Note the differing degrees of state action. Note what they need from accreditation. Note how hard it is for them to be decisive in eliminating poor institutions and programs. See the potential partners in the wings and realize their specific orientation. Note the strong and growing professional organizations that seek actively the professionalization of their specialties. See these all in an increasingly friendly atmosphere characterized by apparent willingness to cooperate.

Now what are some alternatives with respect to Standards on this one issue, forgetting others for the moment:

1. We can sit tight. We can do what we do now. New Standards can reflect the present organization (elementary and secondary education as general categories and separate school service personnel programs at advanced degree levels).

2. The new Standards could move us consciously toward a more generalized base. We could accredit all programs or none. It could be institutional accreditation.

3. The new Standards could consciously move us toward increasing activity with respect to programs in some way or other and to some

degree or other. There might remain a general category (secondary education) with some built-in efforts to determine that the parts (programs) were adequate. Program accreditation might begin where we are ready (with NASM) and await developments where the organization and where Standards are not developed. We might build a cooperative family over a period of years.

These are some things the Standards writing committee must consider and that you must advise them about. We all need to help them to answer with appropriate Standards the conflicting demands of our time. We need to search with them for answers to some very complex problems. We need to try to see the potential of new endeavors, new alignments, and new groupings.

NCATE itself—the 22 Council members—has its task too. Perhaps a conference with regional association secretaries is in order. Perhaps NCATE needs to sponsor some experimental relationships and efforts. Perhaps it needs to explore some possible joint activity with other professional accrediting groups.

Your patience and attention have been most rewarding this morning. Let me thank you and wish you well in your discussions for the rest of the day.

PROFESSIONAL ACCREDITATION OF PROGRAMS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

EDWIN P. ADKINS
Associate Vice President for Research & Program Development, Temple University

For the past two years a committee, appointed by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, has been giving consideration to the problem of writing a new set of national standards against which the quality of programs in teacher preparation may be measured. This committee, of which I have the honor to serve as chairman, is representative of many parts of the teaching profession and of all sections of the country. The entire project including—the writing of standards, trial applications of the new standards, through final approval —will last for about three years. (Many in this audience, I am certain, have been involved in some way in this effort.) At that point, it is hoped we will have arrived at a set of standards with which the profession can live, though all persons cannot be completely satisfied. We do not pretend that we can solve all problems in accreditation forever; we simply hope we can reduce most of the issues to manageable proportions. Without further background, however, let us turn to some of the problem areas with which the committee has been struggling.

The mere mention of national accreditation of programs in teacher education raises what seem at first glance to be problems of an insurmountable nature. Diversity in approach among the hundreds of

colleges and universities and among the states makes any attempt at standardization almost impossible. Yet, as in law or medicine or any other profession, a second thought assures the curious that certain elements are essential in the preparation program for any member of the teaching profession. The dozens of meetings we have had throughout the country have underscored this conclusion.

As a matter of blunt fact, unless the component parts of a good professional program of preparation can be identified and evaluated, there is no such thing as an education profession. It is equally true that the total program must be something more than the accumulation of basic skills and knowledge. The end product must be an educated, professional person, lest he be confused with the craftman, the artisan, or for that matter, the artist. One further thought is essential to the concept. Not only must the teacher be an educated, professional person, but his *entry* into the profession must be controlled *by* the profession.

Herein lies the role of national accreditation. It is the point at which control over entry into the profession is exercised by members of the profession. Not that all things relating to the profession are known. Not that all questions are answered. Not that all elements of the best possible program can be identified with complete certainty. It is even likely that these things can never be known absolutely. Rather, accreditation implies that the profession applies the best that is agreed upon at any particular moment to the programs which produces professional recruits. In this way the accreditation of programs can play an important role in putting to rest—finally—the confusion in the mind of the public, and indeed in the minds of many educators, as to whether education is a profession within the usual meaning of that term.

Hence accreditation is an important element—not the only element to be sure—but an important and crucial one in the final professionalization of teaching. It is a channel through which the profession can be upgraded. It says succinctly, for one thing, that not all colleges can, nor should they be engaged in the business of training people for the profession because not all are equipped to produce the kind of person who should be entering teaching.

In the process of writing the standards which will be applied to programs in professional education, a first problem is that of identifying the "must" elements in any good curriculum. While opinions differ widely on most subjects, almost all would agree that the academic four- or five-year program should be composed of general education, major-minor concentrations in depth, and a set of professional experiences, which, when integrated into a true program, have a chance of producing the professional, educated person about whom we talk so much. A sensible division might be to devote from 30 to 50 per cent of the program to basic, general academic work; from 15 to 30 per cent to professional experiences (depending on the needs of the teacher, for example, as contrasted with the guidance counselor); and 35 to 50 per cent to major-minor concentrations (these would differ significantly in depth and scope for the administrator, the secondary

teacher, and the elementary teacher). These need not be organized necessarily in traditional two or three semester-hour segments.

A sub-problem related to curriculum is the necessity to be as specific as possible and at the same time to leave room for—even encourage—innovation to the end that ever better programs will be developed. The trick, I suppose, is to enforce the best that is known at the moment of application, but to push for the kinds of research and experimentation which will lead constantly to higher levels of achievement. This is no mean feat, obviously, but it must be done. One characteristic of our profession has been, I'm afraid, that we have talked about our problems, constantly talked about them, without doing much about solving them. One result of accreditation can be that we will continue to talk, of course—being teachers we are simply incapable of doing otherwise—but we will be forced to turn more of our energies toward organized solutions of our problems. Among other things we will recognize, as a profession, that we know a great deal more about the skills and attitudes a teacher must have than our differences of opinion in the past would seem to indicate.

Further, in solving the problem of program, we can agree that three additional elements aside from curriculum are essential. These are good students, competent professors, and sufficient resources to implement the program with the high degree of efficiency necessary.

There is no substitute for a reasonable degree of intelligence. The old attitudes held by many within and outside the profession: that anyone can teach; that any liberally educated person can be a teacher, however inadequate his specific preparation for the profession may be; that a teacher is really nothing more than a body employed by a board of education to keep a group of young people off the street or out of their mother's hair for a certain number of hours each day, refute this statement. It is time the profession said that these things are not so, that it *does* take an intelligent person, who possesses certain specific characteristics in personality and motivation as well as in academic achievement, to make a good teacher. But on the other hand it is also true that the time is past due for the college to reassess his own professional offerings in terms of relevancy to the problems of our time. The accreditation process can help to assure that only those who measure up to professional and academic standards will be admitted to teacher education programs.

Almost the same things might be said, and perhaps ought to be said, about the faculty members who staff the college programs. The second-rate will no longer do, academically or professionally. The generalist without scholarly depth does not suffice. The ex-superintendent, long on experience and short on scholarship, is sometimes out of place in the program. The time has come for the profession to assure itself that the professor who occupies a post in the Univeristy combines professional activity and involvement with scholarly purpose *and loses sight of neither.* The autonomy of the individual institution is important and must be preserved; but such autonomy should not provide a cloak for mediocrity. Again accreditation can be of help in demanding quality of our colleges and universities. Nothing less can be tolerated.

Once we have assured ourselves of quality in the student *and* his professor, adequate tools with which to work must be provided. If the language laboratory, for example, is a useful tool in language instruction, and if the school in which the prospective teacher will work usually provides this tool, then it is little short of ridiculous for the teacher training institution to assume that proper education can take place in the absence of such a laboratory somewhere in the training program. Since technology has entered the classroom, this aspect of teacher education is becoming increasingly important. The profession must make certain, through accreditation, that the training institution does indeed provide the physical as well as the scholarly atmosphere in which to educate the modern teacher.

Hence the program of teacher education will put a good student with a good professor who has the necessary tools to do the job. Further they will work together in a curriculum which includes a proper balance between general education, professional education, and depth in appropriate major-minor concentrations. Again it should be emphasized that much of this need not be done through formal, traditionally organized courses.

A second major problem in the accreditation of programs is the evaluation of the student at the time of entry into the profession, whether this be at the fourth or fifth year collegiate level. If the program is so vague, or if the objectives are so unclear that evaluation of the graduate is impossible, then I submit that something is lacking in that institution and in that curriculum (defined as the total four- or five-year experience). Members of our profession will raise many questions at this point. Evaluate what, they will ask. Evaluation instruments are not sufficiently refined, they will say. My answer is simple. If the available instruments of evaluation are not good enough, let us improve them. Let us get on with the job. We have gone long enough without quality controls. Let us as a profession, through the accreditation process in part, demand a quality accounting by our collegiate institutions at the time they submit their products for public assimilation. It is here especially that our learned societies, our professional associations and our special subject-matter organizations can involve themselves in helping to devise curriculum and to evaluate the product of that curriculum. Again nothing less will suffice if we are to improve our teacher education programs.

A third problem inherent in the accreditation process is that of minimum vs. escalating standards. Should we settle for standards low enough so that almost any institution with the desire may be admitted to the teacher-education fraternity? That may be one approach, but it is certainly not the professional one—not if we expect professionals to emerge from these programs. We should never let a shortage of teachers or inferior salary schedules or any other irrelevant factor blind us as to what it takes to meet the minimum standards for our profession. While this is true in medicine or engineering, it is even more true in teaching—the mother of all professions. Professional accreditation again can help us be certain that the mediocre are eliminted and that those who are in the business of teacher education main-

tain the conditions necessary for the production of qualified teachers. The standards therefore must be sufficiently specific to permit intelligent application and at the same time must remain flexible enough to guarantee the raising of those standards to meet the need of each new era as it emerges.

The points just made lead logically to a fourth problem area: that of constant evaluation of the standards, once they have been written, to the end that they be submitted at all times to critical scrutiny in some organized way. Only in this fashion can improvement and updating of the standards be assured. For standards of accreditation, just as courses in history of education, can become antiquated unless subjected to proper research and study. I am glad to report that such a mechanism has been adopted by the profession. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education has been vested with the responsibility to evaluate on a continuing basis the standards which are in force and to recommend changes as appropriate and as research and experience dictate. This should be a great improvement over the past and should help us avoid some of the pitfalls we experienced formerly.

Finally, a fifth problem area involves the process used in applying standards to the programs in teacher education. We can have the best set of standards imaginable, but if the process used in applying those standards is weak or inconsistent, little is accomplished. In fact, professional suicide will result. Again I believe a great improvement has been made in this area. Not only is the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Eduction giving constant attention to improving the application of standards, but a new coordinating board has been created which stands between the NCATE and the profession. This board is composed of representatives of the many parts of the profession, as state departments of education, the TEPS Commission, learned societies, AACTE, and other groups. Their task is to see that the process of accreditation, in all its facets, is carried out properly. This board does not control the NCATE—it would be disastrous if the Council were to lose its autonomy and independence in accreditation. The board, however, does recommend to the Council on behalf of the profession. Hence a channel has been opened which can be used in the total process of improving standards and their application when appropriate.

We think that in the new set of standards which is being tried out on several institutions this year, a viable solution to most of the problems enumerated above has been proposed. After the trial application of the standards, further improvement and refinement will be necessary. But in the end a set of standards and a process of application should result. They won't be perfect, but they will be the kind with which we can live. The end result will be, we trust, more and better quality programs in teacher education. And quality in preparation is requisite to a higher degree of professionalization.

A REACTION FOR THE KANSAS TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION

DARYL E. BERRY
State Consultant, TEPS Commission

I should first like to preface my remarks with a note of commendation for the AACTE in regard to their initiating a study of the NCATE standards. Self-evaluation stands out as a major outcome of the accreditation process; therefore, it is most fitting that accrediting agencies are willing to apply suggested procedures to their own operation.

My first reaction to the new standards is expressed as a concern for the omission of formal statement of proposed objectives of the teacher education institution. The new evaluative criteria indicate that beliefs and assumptions as determined by the institution are the most effective means by which personal and intellectual qualities may be developed. However, it is my judgment that specific ends or objectives against which the effectiveness of the program may be measured are essential or preferred, rather than leaving it to a nebulous reflection of the rationale and content of the programs offered, the policies implemented, and the allocation of personnel and physical resources. Institutions should seek evidence of the effectiveness of their programs in a more formal and concrete manner.

My second reaction is in regard to the provisions for the involvement of professional organizations in making recommendations for teacher education. National and state TEPS Commissions have always been concerned and involved with standards for the preparation of teachers. There is no attempt on our part to advocate proliferation of accrediting agencies. However, support would be given to accrediting secondary programs by a more thorough evaluation of teaching in specific subjects rather than a general approval of all secondary programs. This responsibility should be assumed only through the cooperative efforts of professional organizations and NCATE in approving individual programs. It is thought that professional organizations representing subject disciplines are ready for this type of cooperative action. Guidelines similar to that suggested by Dr. Adkins would be a significant contribution from the professional organization to the total accreditation process. It is believed that guidelines for quality preparation to teach in the various disciplines would serve as "checks and balances" within the total secondary program. TEPS personnel would favor setting standards high enough so that not just anyone could get into the profession. Putting some "teeth" into the general accreditation practice should help to eliminate the mediocre student.

I certainly favor the coordinating board which is made up of many parts of the profession; i.e., State Department of Public Instruction, TEPS Commission, Learned Societies, AACTE, and other groups.

The proposed standards do recognize the existence of professional associations, and it is assumed that their recommendations will be considered. Professional organizations can make excellent contributions

to the profession, as their primary concern is to improve and upgrade the performance and professional attitude of their members.

My third reaction is in the area of evaluating the quality of instruction in the teacher education program. The proposed standards place more emphasis on the evaluation of academic achievement and classroom performance of students in teacher education. It is agreed that the accreditation process can help to assure that only those who measure up to the profession and its academic standards will be admitted to the teacher education program.

There is much concern regarding the end product. Competent teaching requires more than an accumulation of basic skills and knowledge. We would agree that there is a variation of qualities and skills needed for different teaching assignments. However, regardless of the assignment, it takes an intelligent person who possesses certain special characteristics in personality and motivation, as well as in academic achievement, to become a competent teacher. All educators must seek to identify those essential elements in the preparation program which will produce the professional, educated person desired. It could well be that these elements would not be organized necessarily into traditional two or three semester hour courses. The main point is that some method of evaluating teaching performance is imperative. Whether this be done by proficiency examination or some other means, I am not prepared to recommend at the moment. At any rate, we are convinced that more is needed than just transcript evidence that the required courses have been passed.

The previous discussion leads to a major point which emphasizes that entry into the profession must be controlled by the profession. Too often there has been a distinction between a legally certified person and a competent teacher. High standards of certification must be better correlated with high standards of competent, professional practices.

It is my belief that assessing teacher competence is a major responsibility of the teaching profession. Therefore, all members of the profession should be involved in determining basic standards for teaching competence. I agree with Dr. Adkins that unless the component parts of a good professional program of preparation can be identified and evaluated, there is no such thing as an education profession.

My fourth and final reaction concerns the joint participation of academic staffs and teacher education faculties in making decisions about teacher education. It is imperative that there be interaction between these two groups. One of our speakers indicated that a teacher education council was not necessary. However, I am of the opinion that some type of interdepartmental, institutional unit should be responsible for policies and programs related to teacher education. This approach seems quite feasible at a time when the emphasis is placed on accrediting the institution rather than just the school or department of education.

A REACTION FOR THE STATE COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

J. D. McCOMAS, *Dean*
College of Education
Kansas State University

The tone of some of the discussions here today prompts me to make two or three statements: (1) I will apologize to no man for being in the profession of education. It has been called to our attention in a number of ways that it is time we quit acting like second class citizens so that we can be treated as first class ones; (2) we must cease being "Mark Hopkins Normal Schools" and assume the leadership which the times and the profession demand; and (3) Arts and Science and Education people are not nearly so far apart as they and we at times would believe. However, we in education must take the initiative in working with them.

I suppose it would be easy for us to assail weaknesses and inadequacies in the framework of any program of accreditation. However, I am equally convinced that where weaknesses may be most apparent, these are likely to be the areas that colleges and universities have failed to be the least definitive, have been the least certain about elements of a program of teacher preparation, and perhaps less than certain how the parts contribute to the whole of teaching and learning.

Secondly, as seen from this vantage point, if the results of accreditation are to have a measurable impact on institutions, the teacher, the profession and concomitantly upon the various publics, then it is implied that more is needed than just a consistent application of standards and criteria by NCATE and its visitation teams. Granting that criteria should insure a given level of quality; a college, school or department of education which lets these become their exclusive focus might fall short of their respective potentials. It would seem that such efforts at accreditation frequently result in one prior year of spurious effort followed by accreditation, if successful, and then a resulting sigh of relief that "its over". Close attention is not always given to criteria and standards during the intervening period.

It is hoped that the new criteria and the subsequent techniques of visitation and accreditation will be sufficiently convincing and helpful that institutions could be ready for visits which, theoretically, might come at any time. I am sure that I speak for all of my colleagues when I hope the new criteria now being tested will be such that they can be applied in a uniform and reliable manner, with a minimum amount of variance, and not subject to the gross biases of those interpreting them. I would further hope that instructions to institutions requesting accreditatiton have sufficient detail as to how institutions may best prepare and present the data suggested by the criteria and standards. To state the point less diplomatically, accreditation should not depend upon trying to bend to the biases of those who recommend accreditation or denial of it, but sufficient briefing should be conducted to let the institution's cognizant representatives know precisely what is expected.

If this cannot be accomplished through detailed written instructions then perhaps a conference could be held several months in advance which would supplement the written criteria. There must be a more effective way of meeting standards of accreditation other than a folk lore approach of contacting one's neighbor who has been visited by NCATE or by taking the point of view that one must first be visited and through this experience be prepared for subsequent visits of a more pleasant nature.

For the past two or three years many of us have joined those who call for systematic and objective evaluations of both the public schools and departments, schools and colleges of education. Today at this conference we have learned that we are expected to evaluate the program and product in a more objective manner. We find it difficult to disagree with this position, in fact, we support it. However, as we turn to this task, as some of us have recently, we find no model to which we may turn—even as we look to the so called prestigious institutions. For example, research concerning methodology in teaching reading shows conflicting results. No one has yet developed a suitable manner of measuring and predicting teacher effectiveness; language laboratories are being subjected to critical questioning; when measured by conventional tests team teaching has shown no appreciable gains in achievement; and researchers are hard pressed to show that guidance programs have any impact on achievement. Even if we can identify college, program and course goals in terms of behavioral objectives which can be measured, we still have difficulty in proving that such objectives are appropriate and that they are those which really make a difference.

The complexity of the problem has too long overwhelmed us. The magnitude of the problem has too long provided us with an easy out of doing nothing. Perhaps we have been asking the wrong questions or using the wrong measures.

I am sure that those of us here accept the challenges we have had presented. However, I am sure that we would expect NCATE and AACTE to give national leadership in encouraging the exchange of ideas, models and research which appears to be promising in developing the proficiency sought. Too, I think we have a right to expect research conducted by them to see if they through accreditation make a difference.

Aspects of general and professional education have been discussed today. Departments, schools, and colleges of education must accept the responsibility for the program and the product of teacher preparation. I say this even in light of one fifth of all the college credits earned by the teacher are in professional education and four fifths are earned in arts and sciences. Unless we assume such leadership and responsibility results will be piece meal and disappointing.

The task we face is not an easy one, for while teaching has always been an enjoyable and satisfying profession, we have yet to hear those who have some understanding of it say that it is easy.

The colleges and universities present accept the challenges which have been presented to us today and only ask in return that NCATE accept a comparable challenge of continually striving to identify relevent criteria and assessment procedures which will make the profession more viable and correspondingly will make teaching and learning more effective.

A REACTION FOR THE COUNCIL OF CHURCH-RELATED COLLEGES

B. A. Cremeen
Dean of the College
Baker University

There are three or four preliminary comments I should like to make before I present my two reactions to the proposed "Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education."

First, I represent the Kansas Council of Church Related Colleges for this occasion by selection rather than election. Consequently, I assume I shall have to accept all responsibility for errors in my comments. Second, my reactions are to the proposed Standards and not to the addresses of our Resource Leaders. Dean Anderson required me to write out in advance my comments for this occasion. Third, I find the proposed Standards in the main to be challenging, forward-looking, and an excellent guide and point of departure. The freedom of the institution is respected without the loss of guiding principles for experimentation and exploration. Certain points here and there in the Standards "arch my eyebrows." I am reminded, however, that picking on details for criticism may be helpful or may be picayunish and in substance a glorification of one's own ego. The proposed Standards certainly should require all of us to ask the simple question,—Are we trying to do what we are not prepared to do in the field of teacher education?

I wish to make two reactions to the Standards and to Teacher Education in general.

Reaction one: Improvement of Teacher Education requires improved methods of screening students for admission to and continuation in Teacher Education.

The foreword of the Standards calls attention to the fact that the proposed revision places "greater emphasis on the importance of the quality of students admitted to Teacher Education Programs." Section 3 of the Basic Programs, paragraph 1, states that the student for Teacher Education may "have to meet requirements in addition to those needed to enroll in the institution," and reference in general is made to "skills, understandings, and personal characteristics which are unique in teaching." Paragraphs 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4 on page 19 of the Standards Booklet further stress this same proposition.

Our present methods of screening have much to be desired, and this is due not merely to practical difficulties such as inadequate tests and shortage of personnel which many times may be as rationalizing as real. Our current challenge is to devise and operate new programs of selection and continuation which utilize new data that are now available or in process of becoming available. I am suggesting that the resulting screening process will be superior to what we are now using even if the revised process will not be a perfect procedure.

By way of analogy the Mental Hygiene movement is characterized by a current trend in which emphasis is placed not on a person but on a

"person-in-the-environment." As a former teacher of logic I understand that an analogy is an illustration and not proof. Even so, the screening of candidates for Teacher Education implies the "measurement" of "persons-in-the environment," and if we do this we shall find ourselves discarding in part our past programs or at least revising those programs by utilizing the data of recent studies by CEEB, ACT, The Standford Research and Development Center, and many other studies which in my judgment implement a current emphasis of AACTE,—"maintaining a balance between the scientific and humanistic components in education itself and in its study." In this way we shall come closer to the total personality of the teacher candidate. This does not imply that a revised program screening of candidates for teacher education can avoid dealing with certain danger signals such as the ethical implications of discontinuing a student in a program in which he has not failed grade-wise, or the possibilities of legal challenge to certain "measurements" of personality. I suggest that both objections to screening,—and there are objections to any form of screening,—can and must be met. Otherwise we will continue to persent less adequate screening programs as if those programs are as adequate as is now possible.

Reaction two: Teacher Education requires a larger and more effective involvement of "the Total Community."

The proposed Standards imply something of that which I have in mind as found in its Foreword,—"The proposed standards call attention to the quality of the relationship between the teacher preparing institution and the cooperating schools." Section 3, paragraph 6, of the Proposed Standards implies an involvement in depth of all parties professionally concerned with Teacher Education. By way of analogy again let me call attention to a current trend of the Mental Hygiene movement,—"From Part to Comprehensive Planning." I suggest that the improvement of Teacher Education involves Comprehensive Planning and decision-making on the part of Institutions of Higher Learning, Public School Personnel,—in fact, and at the very least,—on the part of all parties professionally related to education.

I do not mean to discount the work that is being done at present in this area by various organizations and institutions such as State Teacher's Organization, Advisory Council, TEPS, etc. I do suggest that what we are doing at present is not enough. There are failures in in communication; there is inadequate sharing of responsibility at the point of decision. Back in 1946 or 1947 I was a member of a state committee of college people who were to work with Floyd Herr on the revision of the Life Certificate. You will recall that revised requirements worked out by this committee and approved by proper state authority went into effect in 1948. A review of what transpired then and has been transpiring since indicates that we are doing much at the planning stage. This conference and other similar conferences illustrate this fact. But we are not getting together adequately at the operational stage. It is at this latter point that ways need to be found to involve the Total Community. I do not know how this can be done. I only suggest that we need to face this problem and attempt cooperatively to work out some solution to it.

Let me illustrate what I mean. The Public School Administrator, e.g., is apt to think that the Teacher Education Program is very largely determined by the College in spite of lip-service to the contrary, and the College, after going through the motion of asking the Administrator for his opinion, guards jealously its grass-roots rights to determine the details of its own program. E.g., the College sets up its own screening program as a step in the direction of improving Teacher Education. Consequently student X is dropped from the program,—perhaps belatedly and in a somewhat cumbersome fashion,—but nevertheless dropped. The College Personnel would like to believe that student X as presently described should not be engaged as a teacher. But what happens? Principal Y at home or in an adjacent state immediately employs that student as a teacher, and is able to do so through some process of temporary or limited certification.

Now I understand the pressure of taking care of classroom needs. I have already stated that our screening processes need improvement. I do not mean to criticize carelessly the employing Principal. My point is that this situation which for us is very real only stresses the fact that we expect a Principal to accept a program in the operation of which he has not received an opportunity directly or through a professional organization to participate in a sufficiently real manner. Consequently, "he and I" are working at cross-purposes with the best of intentions. The Total Community needs to be involved more completely in Teacher Education than is the case in our present set-up. We shall need to face the dilemma of how this can be done while our cherished institutional autonomy is being maintained. Perhaps we shall need to face the painful process of rethinking the meaning of autonomy.

Twenty years ago the ad Hoc Committee referred to previously met in Topeka to consider the recommendations of the sub-committees on General Education and Professional Education for a revised certificate to be conferred by the state office upon satisfactory completion of requirements. One of the leading educators in the state at that time argued against the total recommendation on the grounds that it infringed on the autonomy of the institution. The recommendations, however, were made by the committee and accepted by the Director of Certification, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, and State Board of Education. We have lived with this procedure for 20 years. Has our institutional autonomy really been infringed upon during those years? I do not mean to suggest that autonomy has no value and should be surrendered by the institution. The institution must have certain rights in the area of the determination of its program and related matters. Even if one wanted to give up existing autonomy one could not do so without charter changes. Board of Trustees, church relationships, etc., are involved. I only mean to suggest that procedures can be worked out whereby certain phases of the operation of the program can involve more people without the loss of desired and necessary autonomy. Difficult to do? Yes! Impossible to do? Why not work at the problem to discover what can be done rather than shrug off the suggestion as a hairbrained proposal?

A REACTION FOR KANSAS SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

ALVIN E. MORRIS
Superintendent of Schools
Wichita, Kansas

One's bias can hardly be hidden when discussing a topic as challenging and as personal as this one is to the educator. A major objective for each of us in 1969 must be to endeavor conscientiously to develop standards and evaluative criteria which more adequately meet the needs of the changing and developing field of teacher education, as well as our society.

Some of the foregoing remarks pertain to the standards and evaluative criteria or procedures of accreditation; others pertain to those instiutions preparing teachers. An effort has been made to refer first to the materials in the standards and criteria, and then to raise certain questions based on present existing materials. Illustrations are used to emphasize major points. It is interesting to note that many of the foregoing are issues which were being discussed and questioned some twenty years ago. Yesterday, as well as today, the issues appear to be the following:

1. Structured vs. Unstructured Materials
2. Specificity vs. Generalities
3. Quantitative vs. Qualitative Evidence
4. Minimal Standards vs. Optimal Standards
5. Standardization vs. Diversity of Programs
6. General Accreditation vs. Program Accreditation

QUESTIONS:

1. Terms such as the following are used consistently throughout the document: evidence, data, information, plans, requirements, reports, etc.

   Since the "standards and evaluative criteria" are stated generally, what provisions are there for some uniformity in the interpretation and appraisal of material presented for accreditation purposes?

2. The form states, "Encourage responsible innovation and experimentation in designing and conducting preparation for teachers for all grades and subjects, kindergarten through grade twelve, and for other school personnel." Materials are not to be used for evaluating programs for the preparation of teacher aides or other paraprofessionals.

   When will the accreditation processes and teacher preparation programs become attuned to the times?

   (Preschool programs, post-secondary vocational and technical programs, teacher aides, social workers, school architects, accountants, food service supervisor, etc.)

3. Questions are asked about the quality of the relationship between the teacher-preparing institution and the cooperating schools.
   Are new and different types of relationships between the teacher-preparing insitution and cooperating schools being tried and considered acceptable?
   Preparation of inner-city teachers
   Preparation of departmental coordinators
   Preparation of attendance aides, guards, etc.

4. As I read it, materials applicable to advanced programs at the graduate level are not to be used for the evaluation of nonschool personnel.
   What is meant by the term "nonschool personnel?"
   Public information director who may be a professional journalist
   Professional negotiator who may be an attorney
   Health occupations director who may be a hospital administrator
   Plant facilities director who may be an engineer

5. The material about types of direct experiences for basic and advanced programs interested me very much.
   Are direct experiences being provided to prepare specialists for the positions being filled in public schools?
   Blind teachers
   Hard-of-hearing teachers
   Homebound teachers
   Secondary remedial reading teachers
   Teachers of plastics, technical electronics, etc.

6. Another point that concerned me was the reference that an institution committed to teacher education in its entirety will therefore within its resources provide inservice assistance to the schools in the area which it serves.
   Is this type of service really being provided to aid public schools?
   Compare college services vs. publisher services available to schools
   University services vs. business and industrial services
   College and university services vs. foundation services

7. It is stated, too, that members of the teacher education faculty should have continuing involvement with elementary and secondary schools.
   Can we professional educators find more ways of making this recommendaion a reality?
   Inservice education in most public schools is weak. Exchange assignments are extremely limited.

8. Another point of evaluation was that no institution takes its commitment to prepare teachers seriously unless it tries to arrive at an honest evaluation of its graduates and those persons being recommended for professional certification.
   Does this evaluation include actual follow-up of graduates on the job in public schools?

Do you help with successful beginning teachers?

Do you help with beginning teachers experiencing professional difficulties?

Do you help with revocation of certificates?

9. This question is asked in the forms: For what professional school position does each graduate program prepare personnel? (superintendent, principal, supervisor, specialist, teacher, and/or other positions).

   Are graduate programs being initiated to prepare the specialists needed in public schools?

   Personnel Relations Coordinator

   Specialists for Advanced Placement Courses

   Teachers for the Socially Maladjusted Students

   Director of Informational Services (data processing, planning and programming)

   Insurance Counselor

10. Information is sought, too, about the utilization of diverse institutional resources.

    Should information be sought regarding the utilization of diverse community and public school resources?

    Public Clinics

    Nursery Schools

    Correctional Institutions

    Supply and Delivery Services Department of a public school

    Technical-Procedures Department for processing print and non-print school materials

11. I noticed particularly that the forms employ standards and evaluative criteria about the program of instruction, about faculty, students, resources and facilities, and evaluative procedures and findings.

    May I ask, specifically, why weren't additional evaluative criteria used to determine financial resources?

    Was it contemplated that amount of financial support can be determined indirecly or that amount of financial support needs to be de-emphasized as a measure of quality?

    Why weren't evaluative criteria used to study the organizational and administrative effectiveness of the unit seeking accrediations?

    Aren't these factors pertinent to the competent operation of an educational unit?

SUMMARY

In summary, these standards and evaluative criteria may not reflect enough relevancy to the unique problems of the time in public schools; but, in my opinion they appear to be applicable to the general types of teacher preparation programs needed by public school personnel, and in that sense, are extremely well done.

A REACTION FOR KANSAS TEACHERS

JESSIE NICHOL
President, KANSAS STATE TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

It is a privilege for me to appear, representing the 29,000 members of the Kansas State Teachers Association, and to congratulate those members who are present of the committee who have given such long and thoughtful study to the problems of needed teacher preparation, and to express our approval of the proposal for greater in-depth training. We in the profession have recognized that revision must be made but we have blamed the system—whatever that may be—and have failed to realize that we are a part of the system and that change will not come until we are willing to act to bring it about.

I shall confine my comments to Part I dealing with the basic program. Also, I shall consider especially those ideas related to student teaching since I have served a number of times as a cooperating teacher.

We are pleased that under national accreditation each college and university will have freedom to engage in experimentation and innovation. No guidelines should ever hinder an institution's right to be inventive. We approve the concept that these proposed standards are "minimum standards" and that each institution is urged to set its goals higher and by experimentation to find better ways to prepare future members of the profession.

Teacher education has been attacked and condemned on all fronts. The only part which has not been charged with being so much wasted time (largely) is the student-teaching experience. While it has been rated above the rest of the program, yet we realize improvement is certainly needed here, too. We applaud Standard 2.5, namely; Faculty members who are instructing prospective teachers need to have continuing involvement with school environments so that their teaching and research will be current and relevant to the problems of the present day schools. Elementary and secondary-school personnel feel they share with faculty members of colleges and univerisities a common purpose and interest. As a result, we, and I reflect the thinking of many fellow cooperating teachers, feel the teacher training institution would be wise to plan some type of inservice training for all of us who work with the future teachers in this part of their program. Many times those who have taught for three years are urged to agree to accept students when the teacher has little idea how to proceed. Student teaching may be the high point in the young teacher's preparation but it depends largely upon how the cooperating teacher handles the situation. Some advice and a general plan could be a great improvement. Problems such as: how many classes during the day should he be expected to teach, how much of an orientation should he have before being asked to stand in front of a class, should he begin teaching by working in only one class and gradually increase his teaching load, should the cooperating teacher spend considerable time in the room with him thus being able to suggest improvements or should the fledgling be left to his own

devices with no master teacher at hand, how much responsibility should be delegated to him concerning making plans, also grades. All these and many more need to be pursued and studied by the college, the elementary and secondary school individuals involved.

We also believe that the supervising teacher from the training institution should have time to visit frequently—for the full class period—and later should consult individually with both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. In this consultation he should be ready to offer concrete suggestions and not simply a perfunctory "You are doing fine!"

We, the teachers, believe fully that prospective candidates for teaching should be thoroughly screened as stated in Standards 3.2-3.4, that academic competence is a must but definitely not the only determinant—since personality and various personal characteristics can go far in making the teacher a success or a failure.

We agree with Standard 3.6 that as constituents of the college community prospective teachers should feel free, individually and collectively to express their views on the teacher education program—through their own organization, through joint student-faculty groups or through representatives on faculty committees.

We also believe that each institution should have a plan for evaluation of the teachers in the field, whom it has prepared. After such evaluation it can better judge the quality of its program and can set about improving where improvement is needed.

Yes, we all agree the need is great. It has been felt by all. At this stage we recall the words of Ralph Waldo Emerson "Nothing great was ever achieved without enthusiasm" as we feel a sense of jubilance and enthusiasm for we believe we are now on the highroad toward improvement, leading to a brighter future for the profession.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF KANSAS COLLEGE CONFERENCE AND TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS CONFERENCE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

EDWARD C. POMEROY, *Executive Secretary*
American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education

The nineteen years that have elapsed since the first Kansas College Conference on Teacher Education have seen many changes in American teacher education. Today there is no aspect of education that is in such a state of ferment as is teacher education.

The Kansas Advisory Council of Education, the institutions of higher education in Kansas, the State Department of Public Instruction and the Kansas State Teachers Association who have cooperated in planning this session are to be congratulated for their leadership. The education of teachers is a matter of importance anywhere, but in the State of Kansas it has been the focus of much thought, study and action.

Kansas has been a leader of states during the past two decades as teacher education has moved to the forefront of action and change in American education.

Outstanding educators from the State of Kansas have provided significant leadership for the nation in developing new goals and new standards of excellence. Such Kansans as Floyd Herr, Rees Hughes, Ruth Stout, John King, C. O. Wright and Kenneth E. Anderson, to name only a few, have worked long and hard in local, state and national efforts to improve the education of teachers. It is my honor to salute these leaders on behalf of educators everywhere, for without their hard work and presight, we would not be considering the proposed Standards and Evaluative Criteria for the Accreditation of Teacher Education.

The program of presentations and discussions of today have proven useful in underlining the current status of teacher education and its effective evaluation. We all are chastened, I am sure, by the complexities of teacher education and of the great responsibilities we all share if teachers are to be properly prepared.

The encouraging point we all need to keep in mind as we conclude our discussions today is that accreditation of teacher education institutions is changing and evolving toward new and, according to our estimates, more effective efforts to evaluate collegiate programs of teacher preparation. We can take heart from the fact that great progress has been made since July 1, 1954 when the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Educaion first assumed responsibility for accrediting. At that time the major thrust was to widen the base of involvement in the process. What heretofore had been an activity of colleges and universities alone was now widened to include chief state school officers, state certification directors, practicing teachers and school board members. Never before had these five important constituencies had the responsibility of working together at such demanding tasks. As we look back to those days 14 years ago, we can recognize great progress in welding together strengthened relationships built upon new confidences and new understandings of our common interests. As we look ahead in teacher education, it becomes more clear each day how important these relationships are.

Even as a voluntary effort, accreditation of teacher education has moved ahead gaining strength and recognition based upon careful and thoughtful effort by the contributed effort of many in this audience and in similar groups of educators throughout the nation.

The 14 years just past have seen a great debate between the academicians and the professional educators. It has been a struggle marked by much give and take but one that has moved to new understanding and new and improved provisions for the preparations of teachers. Today representatives of learned disciplines are shouldering increased responsibility for planning teacher preparatory programs, and as full-fledged members of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, these representatives insure increased higher education support of teacher education.

Progress in securing support for teacher education has been made far beyond the fondest hopes of only a few years ago. The academicians

and the professional educators are working together as never before on campuses and on NCATE alike. Teacher education has been recognized as a legitimate field of higher education and the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education has been assigned the responsibility as the officially recognized accrediting agency for teacher education by the National Commission on Accrediting. This recognition has sufficiently cleared the air in the college and university community regarding teacher education to enable constructive efforts to move forward.

The time is now right for another forward thrust in the accreditation of teacher education. The revision of the standards currently being undertaken by the AACTE, aided by thousands of educators and scores of their organizations, is the vehicle for improvement.

As at any other time in the history of accreditation of teacher education, there are those who can find reasons to deprecate the process but the fact of the matter is today there is support and confidence backing proposed changes where before there has been uncertainty and weakness.

The current standards are pointing the way to greater flexibility in institutional planning, are urging greater depth in curriculum planning, are showing the need for increased direct experience properly planned and supervised bringing with it a newly expanded role for teachers and school systems in teacher education, and finally are calling for major scientific evaluation of the product in addition to the more traditional look at the process. The impact which these proposed standards can have on the future of teacher education is substantial. We have had an opportunity today to consider what some of the implications of this effort are. We have also seen some of the difficulties which continue to challenge all of us who are concerned with the development of truly professional teachers prepared for meaningful contributions to the education of American young people.

I believe that my brief analysis of where we have been in teacher education and where we now stand in regard to the accreditation of teacher education underlines the progress that has been made in this field and indicates that we are moving to new levels of acceptability in our continuing effort to improve the quality of programs of teacher education.

What of the future? Where are we headed in the accreditation of teacher education? In conclusion I wish to touch on these questions because I believe the answers we give have great significance.

First let us acknowledge, what we all know so well but what we frequently overlook, the fact that great changes are taking place and will continue to take place in teacher education. These changes are resuling from many conditions, new research, technical innovation, greater sophistication in understanding how people learn and above all from the changing needs of society. These changes are going to come with increasing rapidity. We and teacher education are being challenged to make our efforts more relevant. The new standards are a sincere effort to modify our accreditation procedures and to introduce greater flexibility and adaptability.

A significant part of the current thrust in the development of standards is the continuing attention to these criteria which is already

projected for the future. The built-in concept of continual review and change in the standards based on experience and new knowledge is a commitment to the effort to develop teacher education programs which are relevant to the needs of our society and its teachers.

The role of accreditation of teacher education and the development of the new standards which we have been considering at this conference have been built on the concept of involvement of all who are concerned with the great task of preparing teachers. This was the basic principle behind the establishment of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education back in the 1950's. The broadened base of the accreditation process was the forerunner of today's wide participation in teacher education.

The involvement of the learned societies and the organizations of professionals in specialized fields in education in the development of the new standards and the role envisioned for these groups in the process of accreditation is a central part of the growth of NCATE. The gap in involvement which has marked the past history of teacher education now shows evidence of closing. This move which is stimulating positive response from all sectors of education when coupled with the increased flexibility of accreditation points the way to further improvements for teacher education.

As we conclude our discussions together, we can do so with confidence that much has been accomplished in developing teacher education and that the prospects for continuing improvement were never better.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP I

Chairman: GEORGE CLELAND, State Department of Public Instruction
Recorder: EDWYNA GILBERT, University of Kansas

Group 1 was composed of classroom teachers, administrators, and professors from colleges and universities; therefore, the first part of our time was spent defining our individual objectives and asking questions about NCATE's role in evaluation. Dr. Cleland explained NCATE's evaluatives criteria and the differences between Kansas State Department accreditation and that of NCATE. There was much interest in the problem that teacher education institutions have in screening students before, during, and after their enrollment in the teacher education program. The group felt that an NCATE accreditation could not possibly cover the excellence or lack of it for individual departments and students from those departments; therefore, it was suggested that professional organizations (KATE in English, for example) might help NCATE by evaluating the individual department and its program. No consensus was reached.

During the afternoon session, the group discussed general education requirements and their relevance to the program of the prospective

teacher. One member of the group told about Baker University's general education program started this year to integrate all areas under the heading of "Man's Search for Meaning." Another group member expressed the idea that the junior colleges might be able to make an excellent contribution in the area of general education. Discussion followed on student involvement, the "educated man," and purposes of accreditation.

The group agreed that accreditation criteria should provide a basis for evaluation of individual programs and should help schools to help themselves in the continual process of attaining excellence.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP II

Chairman: Kenneth N. Nickel, Wichita State University
Recorder: M. Evelyn Swartz, University of Kansas

1. *Role of NACTE.* The general evaluation given by NCATE is still needed to offset unrealistic goals of special organizations and to supervise new developments in education.
2. *Five-Year Teacher Education Programs.* Although recommended years ago, laws have not been written to accomplish this. Concerned educators can influence legislation for the enactment of the Professional Practices Act. It is strongely recommended that other groups follow the example of TEPS and support this.
3. *Inadequacies of Profesional Preparation in Teacher Education.* The chief problems are: lack of time in a four-year program, especially for student teaching; lack of special preparation for cooperating teachers; and lack of emphasis on the practical aspects of teaching (discipline, etc.). It is recommended that in-service and/or certification programs for cooperating teachers be started. Cooperation between teacher education institutions and public schools in many ways, including the use of public school personnel on teacher education curriculum councils. There should be more student participation in public schools prior to student teaching, as is done in Wichita and Manhattan.
4. *Evaluation of College Teaching.* Although there are problems, it is recommended that plans be worked out so that students do not have to take vital courses which are poorly taught.
5. *Certification.* It is recommended that states work further on reciprocity of certification. The chief problem is the low standards of some states. Also, secondary teachers should not be certified to teacher elementary school unless they complete an elementary program.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP III

Chairman: Warren Ostrom, Washburn University
Recorder: Genevieve Hancox, University of Kansas

It is doubtful that NCATE is understood by the profession as a whole. The problems concern not only teacher-training institutions but the entire educational system. Accrediting and certification are so complex that perhaps both are coming to mean less and less.

NCATE should probably join forces with the special professional organizations. A program once strong may not always be strong; the quality changes as the faculty changes. Each program within an institution should be examined regularly by persons competent in the particular area. That this is costly is the big problem. Perhaps the professional school itself should accept more responsibility for assessing the quality of a student's academic background. (Also, it might well pay more attention to its own teaching.)

What happens to first-year teachers is another responsibility of the training institution. Administrators, for their part, should not put first-year teachers in difficult situations. Teaching in ghetto schools is almost an entirely different profession.

As for evaluation, guidelines are needed. It is the *product* that is important; the number of books in an institution's library as a criterion for evaluation is an example of too much concern with form and not enough with substance. It is suggested that we ask, rather, such questions as the following: Are the graduates actually in key educational positions? Are they going on to graduate schools? Are they active in professional organizations and in other ways behaving like master teachers? Do they get along well in their communities? What are the subjective opinions of their administrators?

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP IV

Chairman: Arnold Moore, Kansas State University
Recorder: Lona Newcomer, University of Kansas

The session began with a discussion of whether specific or general programs should be checked for accreditation. Some institutions are so large that difficulty may be experienced in evaluating specific programs. A general evaluation seemed to be more valuable for small schools than for large ones. Some participants recommended that both general and specific evaluations be used and suggested that examining teams should not have specific prejudices.

A suggestion was made that efforts of accrediting agencies, such as the North Central Association and NCATE, should be coordinated. This plan would eliminate multitudinous visits by agencies. Chairmen should attempt to use standards that will be applicable to all types of institutions. Uniform accreditation for all states should be considered.

The U.S. Office of Education must help in evaluating work taken in foreign countries. The knowledge of specialists needs to be utilized.

The public schools can provide laboratories and ideas on policy making for teacher-education curricula, and their personnel needs to become involved. One person expressed the opinion that students and employers of graduates should supply some feedback to schools.

Some participants felt that perhaps a continuous process of experimentation and research should be developed so that institutions do not examine their work only when they are to be inspected. This procedure might place more emphasis on quality. Some people felt that research for publication may sometimes be stressed so much that teaching may suffer. More teaching-oriented research was mentioned. Maintaining an acceptable or desirable teaching load and becoming involved in research seemed to be almost impossible for some, especially when student activities and committee work are not measured in the teaching load.

One individual raised the question about whether students should be screened more carefully before they enter the teacher-education program. Several agreed that this process is very important and should be given more consideration.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP V

Chairman: HAROLD LOWE, Merriam Elementary School
Recorder: MILO STUCKY, University of Kansas

Opinions representing diverse positions were expressed by members of the group regarding evaluation. One member urged that NCATE should not be receptive to various area groups' attempts to influence standards, while another suggested that these organizations should be welcomed and that their participation should be sought.

Other observations made were as follows:

1. Reciprocity in accreditation between states is enhanced by rigorous standards of evaluative criteria.
2. Programs should furnish more opportunity for student experience with classroom situations.
3. New teachers are better than the public has a right to expect them to be.
4. We must continually reexamine the programs in the light of determining proper ingredients for the teaching credential. For example: What is a suitable "mix" in the preparation program for the elementary certificate?
5. Have we given the public the impression that we do not know our business? If so, how has that impression been conveyed? By appealing to the public for consultation and involvement?
6. We should freely admit our inadequacies. Frank and candid stances engender confidence.

7. Too many program classes in the institutions are taught by graduate students.
8. Professors of education should have had wide and varied experiences in the public schools.

There seemed to be the consensus that college programs lacked practicality and failed to prepare students for the stark conditions which they are called upon to face in the public schools.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP VI

Chairman: Edward Hiner, St. Benedict's College
Recorder: Paikley Rogers, University of Kansas

The fourteen members of this group focused their discussions on the following facets of teacher education and accreditation:

1. The nature of some obstacles to increasing the degree of cooperation between academic groups and NCATE.
2. The role(s) of academic discipline groups in the development of the missing 4/5 of the teacher education curriculum (content).
3. The need for more time and people on the NCATE visitation teams.
4. The need for the identification and description of the evidence for evaluation by at least three major divisions: (a) experts in the content fields, (b) experts in teaching methodology, and (c) experts in each field of educational specialization.
5. The need to identify and describe the *nature of the evidence to* be employed by NCATE Visitation Teams. Effect of this on the number and qualifications of the NCATE Teams? Potentials for positive effect on institutional self-evaluation?
6. The potentiality of utilizing representatives from 4c (above) at time the institution was making its self-study?
7. How and on what evidence shall the teacher-preparing institutions evaluate their product?
8. Total agreement that NCATE is still needed, but some concerns about the nature of the evidence needed for evaluation by the revised standards.
9. The nature of the evidence employed for decisions on selection and retention of the student teachers in a program of preparation. Multiple criterion must be employed and the subjective nature of our evidence kept in mind. The need for a "second chance."
10. The need for experimentation in teacher-preparation programs and the nature of resistance to change: ESSO at Emporia State was described.

11. How do we measure the product of these experimental programs? The role of supervising teacher is crucial, along with on-the-job follow-up and graduate's feelings of competence.
12. The attendent problems of recruiting the master-teachers for our practice teachers. Role of college and school district in selection of the master-teacher requires more time and insight and practice-teacher in order to secure optimum matching of their needs and expectations.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP VII

Chairman: DONALD R. BARBER, St. Mary of the Plains College
Recorder: PHIL RUESCHHOFF, University of Kansas

Group Reaction to the address by Rolf. W. Larson

1. Interaction with all referent groups and disciplines is needed for good teacher education programs.
   a. Professional educators need to initiate interaction—much is under way at present and much has been done within the past five years.
   b. NCATE could become the major accrediting team with all disciplines and/or related disciplines represented. Such a team with such representation would be large in number but possess scope.
   c. Teacher education evaluation must include evaluation of all related disciplines. Teacher education programs are only as good as supporting disciplines.

Group Reaction to the address by Edwin P. Adkins

1. Individual institutions should have the liberty to develop unique programs of their own without dictates from accrediting agencies.
2. Accrediting agencies need to move slowly while establishing policies for institutions.

Others:

1. Business managers in Public School Systems need certification—some for "status" purposes.
2. Teacher education programs need to initiate and/or upgrade present student follow-up programs.
   a. Follow-ups are perhaps best the third or fifth year.
   b. Teachers need time and experience to evaluate their teacher education.
   c. In-service teachers' evaluations should be used to strengthen teacher education programs.
3. Teacher Unions are probably here to stay and may well continue to insure excellence in performance since criteria have been developed for this.
4. Five-year teacher education programs will probably be established; however criteria for these need to be developed.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP VIII

Chirman: SISTER MAGDALITA BRUNS, Marymount College
Recorder: HEROLD REGIER, University of Kansas

Accreditation of the preparation of teachers should include being concerned with courses and content in academic areas.

The group seemed satisfied with the course offerings in elementary education but questioned present programs in the preparation of 4th, 5th, and 6th grade teachers where specialization in content areas needs emphasis. Programs for preparation of junior high school teachers were considered inadequate.

Concerns were expressed about how to identify prospective teachers early in their educational career and how to encourage college students to decide upon teaching as a vocation.

Prestige of teachers as viewed by society was considered.

Curriculum committee teamwork in developing teacher-education programs should include public school teachers and college faculty.

Problems of developing programs for teachers in the small liberal arts colleges were identified. Unique programs with specialization in limited areas can provide strengths in those programs offered. The Associated Colleges of Central Kansas have established cooperative programs by sharing faculty members in teacher education, including methods courses.

Courses offered for graduate credit for experienced teachers should be in keeping with the teacher's needs and interests. Teachers are able to make self-appraisals, and graduate programs should be very flexible rather than highly structured.

A major concern is how to evaluate teachers and teaching. The best method seems to be to measure the product of the school.

Objectives need to be clearly defined and then evaluations made accordingly. Research-oriented faculty members are needed in order to make reliable evaluations. Video tapes may be one answer to evaluating teacher performance and pupil responses. New and different kinds of instruments need to be developed to appraise the total instructional program.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP IX

Chairman: AARON W. HARPER, Kansas State College of Pittsburg
Recorder: GERALD CARNEY, University of Kansas

The first session, following an address by Rolf W. Larson of NCATE, was a discussion of problems encountered in the evaluation of teacher training institutions as enumerated by the speaker.

That NCATE placed most of the emphasis on professional education and little on subject matter areas, which constitute about 80 percent of the requirements for a degree, was of some concern to the group although it

did not favor turning accreditation over entirely to national professional associations.

The second session, following an address by Edwin P. Adkins of AACTE, steered the discussion along different channels. It was agreed that the philosophy of accrediting insitutions as a whole, even though at the moment some subject matter areas were not up to standard, was an acceptable procedure.

Following further discussion the group decided to attempt to arrive at a consensus of opinion, by drawing upon ideas presented by the two speakers ,as to procedures to be suggested for evaluating teacher-training programs.

The group believed the main problem was that of evaluating the whole program while not neglecting the parts. In this case the parts were: general education, professional education and the subject matter areas.

The following suggestions were formulated:

1. Only one national agency be responsible for overall accreditation.
2. This agency would require self-evaluating reports from each subject matter area indicating the degree to which the area believed it had met standards formulated by it's national professional organization.
3. That opinions of students be considered in the total evaluation.

Group 9 was encouraged by the progress made, despite difficulties encountered, in evaluating teacher education institutions.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP X

Chairman: W. CLEMENT WOOD, Fort Hays Kansas State College
Recorder: I. N. BOWMAN, University of Kansas

In response to the question posed by Dr. Larson relative to the withdrawl of NCATE's emphasis on undergraduate education, it was the consensus of the group that such a move should be avoided. With the growing emphasis on graduate education the undergraduate area could be neglected.

There was a unanimous expression that NCATE would have to go into programs as well as general accreditation—that heavy reliance would need to be given to specialists as well as generalists, and the various special areas would need to be given some voice in the development of standards. The general opinion was expressed that some central body would need to continue to exercise strong leadership in the area and that body should be NCATE.

To the question "What does the public really want" this group seemed to feel that the public or the various publics needed to have confidence that the stamp of NCATE really meant something—that it is strong evidence of a superior program in teacher education.

Some reactions to some of the NCATE standards:

(a) It was conceded that a better job was done in developing questions, but the problem remained: How good should the answers be. In other words, how bad must the whole pattern be before it was considered too bad, i.e., failing.

(b) There should be a clarification of the research requirement. It should not be the role of the standard to superimpose one ideaology over another (i.e., teaching vs. research).

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP XI

Chairman: Leonard M. Chaffee, Wichita State University
Recorder: Robert Hohn, University of Kansas

Rather than resolving the issues raised by Dr. Larson, the group's discussion succeeded in expanding and clarifying them. It is perhaps best to summarize the group's comments by enumerating the question they posed.

1) What is general accreditation? What is specific accreditation? Does evaluation of each specific program area lead to an accurate over-view? Is it possible to have a teacher-training program that is accredited in one area and not in another? What effect would this situation have on a specific teacher-in-training who needed both kinds of accreditation?

2) How are NCATE visiting teams formed? Are there problems in having a team of "experts" evaluate an over-all program? Can visiting teams evaluate every individual program? Are they forced to rely on written reports? Can the "writing style" of the institution affect its evaluation?

3) Does NCATE force individual schools to look at themselves? Should a school define its own standards and then have NCATE judge them in terms of how well they attain these standards? Or should NCATE insist on certain standards for all schools?

4) Can NCATE enforce change? Is it their responsibility to do so? Can politics interfere in their refusal to accredit large schools? Don't small schools have a right to be bitter if this is the case? Several examples of this possibility were suggested.

5) What use is made of NCATE accreditation by the institutions? Is an acceptable accreditation used as a lever over the state legislature? Do schools use accreditation for publicity? Do prospective students or counselors take note of NCATE accreditation?

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP XII

Chairman: Richard Shepherd, Kansas State Teachers Association
Recorder: Gary Hoeltke, University of Kansas

The initial point considered by members of Discussion Group 12 was the need for, or the desirability of, multiple accrediting agencies

(National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, North Central Association, State Deparment, various professional organizations). Without reaching agreement on either the need for, or desirability of, the group did tend to agree that so long as multiple agencies exist, then the National Council or Accreditation of Teacher Education should play an active role in coordinating the efforts of the various accrediting agencies. Also, there was some agreement that NCATE should carry on some research on accreditation if resources permit research.

Another problem that produced little agreement among members of the group was whether an institution's product or program should be evaluated. Some of the specific topics that concerned this question was whether senior colleges should evaluate junior colleges, and whether grade-point averages should be considered in the evaluation.

A third discussion point concerned the role of classroom teachers in the teacher-preparation process. It was agreed by most discussion participants that classroom teachers should be more actively engaged in the process but there was no agreement on either where in the process or how they would be involved in the process.

A final point that was accepted by the group was that the State Departments do in fact accredit teacher-training institutions but related questions of effectiveness of accreditation and whether State Departments should accredit failed to to produce agreement.

In addition to the above other discussion points were raised. However, the other points raised were not developed and, consequently, are not included in this summary.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP XIII

Chairman: August Zemke, Sunset Elementary School, Salina
Recorder: Paul Haack, University of Kansas

Mr. Rolf Larson, keynote speaker of the morning, visited discussion group 13 and responded to questions. With regard to the possibility of NCATE and NASM or other area accreditation agencies working together, Mr. Larson felt that such efforts are worthwhile but likely to be ensnarled in many problematic details. He also explained the relationship of NCATE to North Central. While North Central's first evaluation of a new program will be very detailed, their general institutional evaluation is broad. NCATE will not attempt to evaluate a new program until North Central has given it accreditation. Beyond that point, there is some duplication of effort by the two agencies, and again, a combined effort might be possible and desirable.

New NCATE evaluation standards will place emphasis on faculty effectiveness and require evidence of this in terms of student accomplishment and "the finished product." Programs, administration and organization, and teacher preparation (as differentiated from teacher performance) will be of less concern.

The afternoon discussion began with the problem of how one objectively evaluates the finished product. Suggestions included utilization of principal's ratings of student teachers and new teachers by means of checklists provided by the colleges; employment of the evaluative techniques and criteria commonly used by merit-raise committees; and the utilization of other types of criteria such as the percentage of teachers from an institution who remain in the profession for a significant duration.

With regard to the question of student participation in the determination of program content, it was felt that more than random or unsolicited student reactions are necessary. College education professors should solicit student evaluations of courses (anonymous and after grading) and of the program in general through follow-up critiques after graduation as well as after the first or second year of teaching. Greater cooperation between colleges and the public schools appears mandatory.

In addition, some improved relationships were reported between education and academic departments as a result of interdepartmental appointments. Several schools reported that, in some academic areas, basic courses are designed to include methods and are taught by a specialist in the academic discipline. It was observed that more favorable attitudes toward the education school seem to accompany more stringent entrance and graduation requirements.

REACTIONS OF DISCUSSION GROUP XIV

Chairman: Truman Hayes, Kansas State Teachers College
Recorder: Oscar M. Haugh, University of Kansas

Six problem areas were identified and the issues raised and suggested solutions were as follows:

1. *Relating Academic Departments to Professional Education*: Evaluation of the contribution of academic areas has been weak. Academicians need to be brought into the evaluative process, but the question is "HOW?" Communication between academic and professional areas may be promoted by NCATE visiation. Inter-teaching between departments may help to make each aware of the other's problems.

2. *Consulting the Students*: Students can help to evaluate the success of a program of study and to identify weak areas. Graduates with experience can give more valid judgments than students in training. New NCATE criteria will require more from institutions about follow-up studies of their graduates.

3. *Screening Prospective Teachers*: Screening should start early—the fifth year internship is too late. Identifying criteria of effectiveness is difficult, for research studies don't agree. The responsibility of identifying the "unfit" should be a dual one, both by the academic department and the department of education. Academic screening is easy compared to handling the student with emotional problems. Some institutions re-

ported using the "Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey" for this, while others reported more inter-faculty communication and smaller classes as the most helpful way of identifying the student with emotional problems.

4. *Increasing Experience*: Suggestions included providing a course in Education early in the General Education portion of the program, getting the student into the classroom early as an observer and as a teacher aid, using micro teaching, increasing the length of the student-teaching period, and providing a full-year internship. The pros and cons of the five-year program were discussed but not resolved.

5. *Improving Research*: Most research in teacher education is done in departments of education—little is done by personnel in academic areas. Conducing research in the General Education area may bring teachers in the academic areas into the research program. Findings from research that are already available need to be communicated both to academic and education personnel.

6. *Improving Graduate Training of Teacher Education Specialists*: Graduate programs need to be flexible for the teacher education specialist. A proper balance between subject matter and instruction in professional education is desirable. Actual public school experience is a must for the specialist working with prospective public school teachers.

CONFERENCE PROGRAM

8:30- 9:15 Coffee and Registration, Lobby of the Kansas Union Building

9:30 First General Session, Big 8 and Jayhawk Rooms

Presiding: Kenneth E. Anderson, University of Kansas

Greetings: Marie M. Hayden, State Superintendent of Public Instruction

Introduction of Speaker: F. Floyd Herr, State Department of Public Instruction

Address: Rolf W. Larson, Director, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education

10:30-10:45 Coffee Break

10:45-12:00 Discussion Groups

12:15- 2:00 Second General Session, Luncheon, Ballroom, Kansas Union

Presiding: Benjamin A. Gessner, Baker University and President Kansas Advisory Council on Education

Invocation: Reverend Henry Gardner, Superintendent of Schools, Archdiocese of Kansas City in Kansas

Introduction of Speaker: Kenneth E. Anderson, University of Kansas

Address: Edwin P. Adkins, Associate Vice-President for Research and Program Development at Temple University and Chairman of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education's Evaluative Criteria Study Committee

2:00- 3:15 Discussion Groups

3:15- 4:30 Third General Session

Presiding: Melvin E. Neeley, Executive Secretary, Kansas State Teachers Association

Reaction: For Kansas Teacher Education and Professional Standards: Daryl E. Berry, State Consultant

For State Colleges and Universities: J. D. McComas, Kansas State University

For Council of Church-Related Colleges: Benjamin A. Gessner, Baker University

For Kansas School Administrators: Alvin E. Morris, Wichita Public Schools

For Kansas Teachers: Jessie Nichol, President, Kansas State Teachers Association

Summary Statement of the Conference: Edward C. Pomeroy, Executive Secretary, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education